



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,336	06/27/2001	Daniel W. Doll	1082-496	1135
7590	11/18/2003		EXAMINER	
Joseph A. Walkowski Traskbritt, PC P. O. Box 2550 Salt Lake City,, UT 84110			MILLER, EDWARD A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3641	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/893,336	DOLL ET AL.
	Examiner Edward A. Miller	Art Unit 3641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18,23,26 and 30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17,19-22,24,25,27-29 and 31-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Art Unit: 3641

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. In view of applicants' reply, claims 18, 23, 26 and 30 are withdrawn from consideration as not being drawn or generic to the elected species. They will be rejoined if they are ultimately dependent on an allowable generic claim.
3. Claims 1-17, 19-22, 24, 25, 27-29 and 31-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Otani et al. '969 in view of Aubert et al. '668, Shepherd '000 and French 465,082.

Otani et al. teach the basic invention of melt cast explosives with dinitro aromatics, oxidizer, aluminum metal fuel, etc. In view of Aubert et al., Shepherd and French 465,082, variation of the various notoriously well known additives, amounts and so forth would have been obvious. In particular, note the French reference which in lines 16-21, teaches the combination of aluminum metal, nitrated aromatic hydrocarbons, and ammonium perchlorate. Note that the broad recitations read on many and various dinitro aromatics as taught in the references, and that "oxidizer" of the broad claims reads on various oxidizers, including organic ones such as TNAZ of Aubert et al. In particular, Shepherd at col. 4, lines 5-6 suggests DNT, and at lines 14-18 following, that the amounts may be in the general range claimed by applicants. It is well settled that optimizing a result effective variable is well within the expected ability of a person of ordinary skill in the subject art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980), *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955). Indeed, some of these references may be the epitome of obviousness, anticipation, as to the broader claims. *In re Pearson*, 181 USPQ 641 (CCPA 1974).

Dinitroanisole is a notoriously well known dinitro-aromatic, but proper claims limited thereto, e.g., requiring such, could be found allowable upon demonstration of unexpected results or

Art Unit: 3641

upon convincing argument, and upon overcoming the obviousness type double patenting which follows below.

The case of obviousness also exists with claims such as 12-14, 37, 38, 41-42, defined by results or properties, as the properties or results must follow from the recited material claim limitations. The results are inherent in the compositions. Where the product appears to be the same or only slightly different, the properties recited would appear to be inherent. The Office does not have testing facilities to determine such. The burden falls on applicant to show that the prior art products do not necessarily or inherently possess the claimed properties. *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 697, 227 USPQ 964, 966; *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596; *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255; 195 USPQ 430, 433-434; *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 173 USPQ 685.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-17, 19-22, 24, 25, 27-29 and 31-48 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the respective claims of copending Applications No. 09/893,337 and 09/747,303 ('303 to issue on 11/18/2003 as US Pat. # 6,648,998). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of clear overlap. In all cases, the basic ingredients are dinitro aromatic compounds with various additives. As claimed, the additives in the broadest claims of each

Art Unit: 3641

case differ, but all the claims have the scope of "comprising". Thus, the claims are amenable to this rejection as currently written. Potentially, this may be overcome in prosecution by limitations added to the respective claims to better define patentability.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning either this or an earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to Examiner Edward A. Miller at (703) 306-4163. Examiner Miller may normally be reached Monday-Thursday, from 10 AM to 7 PM.

If attempts to reach Examiner Miller by telephone are unsuccessful, his supervisor Mr. Carone can be reached at (703) 306-4198.

If there is no answer, or for any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the application status, please call the Group receptionist at (703) 308-1113.

Miller/em
November 17, 2003



EDWARD A. MILLER
PRIMARY EXAMINER